PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

FILE: Office: PHOENIX, AZ Date: MAR 11 2004

IN RE:

PETITION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Acting District Director, Phoenix, Arizona, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure admission into the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is married to a naturalized citizen of the United States. The applicant seeks the above waiver of inadmissibility in order to remain in the United States with her husband and U.S. citizen children.

The acting district director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *See* Decision of the Acting District Director, dated March 13, 2003.

On appeal, counsel states that Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) abused its discretion in denying the Form I-601 in light of the extensive equities in the case.

The record contains a declaration of the applicant's spouse, undated; a copy of the marriage certificate and a copy and translation of the wedding invitation for the applicant and her spouse; a copy of the naturalization certificate of the applicant's spouse; copies of documents evidencing the scholastic and extracurricular performance of the applicant's eldest child; a copy of the baptismal certificate of the applicant's eldest child; copies of cards given by the eldest child and the applicant's spouse to the applicant and vice versa; copies of photographs of the applicant and her family; copies of the U.S. birth certificates of the applicant's three children; declarations of family and friends; verification of employment for the applicant and her spouse and copies of financial and tax documents for the couple. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

> (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

> (1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

The record reflects that the applicant attempted to obtain entry into the United States by presenting a fraudulent alien registration card to immigration officials.

A section 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from violation of section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the alien herself experiences upon deportation is irrelevant to section 212(i) waiver proceedings; the only relevant hardship in the present case is that suffered by the applicant's husband.

Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565-566 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

Counsel asserts that the economic and social conditions in Mexico are such that the applicant's husband will be unable to find employment and the couple's children will receive insufficient education and medical attention. *See* Appeal from Denial of I-601 Waiver, dated April 9, 2003. Counsel contends that the applicant's husband will lose his home, job and family security if he departs from the United States and returns to his native country. *Id.* at 6. Counsel further predicts that if the applicant's husband finds employment in Mexico, he will not earn enough income to support his family and will not receive health insurance benefits comparable to the medical coverage his family enjoys in the United States. *Id.* at 8.

However, counsel does not establish extreme hardship if the applicant's husband remains in the United States in order to further his children's education, maintain access to adequate health care and pursue his career. The AAO notes that, as a naturalized U.S. citizen, the applicant's spouse is not required to reside outside of the United States as a result of denial of the applicant's waiver request. Although the AAO acknowledges the desire of the applicant's husband that his wife continue to care for their children, the record does not establish that the applicant is the only person able to fulfill that role. *See* Affidavit of Mr. Jesus Manuel Haro, undated. Further, counsel contends that if the applicant's husband remains in the United States, he will be forced to maintain two households. The record does not establish that the applicant will be unable to work to support herself financially while residing in Mexico. Moreover, the AAO notes that the U.S. Supreme Court held in *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship.

U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *Hassan v. INS*, *supra*, held further that the uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's husband will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, his situation,

based on the record, is typical to individuals separated as a result of deportation or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.